

Class I Executive Agent (EA) Readiness Assessment Preliminary Results

February 2012



COMPLEX PROBLEMS. PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS.

Agenda

- **Overview**
- Findings
- Recommendations



Readiness Assessment Purpose and Approach

- Purpose - assess efficiency and effectiveness of Class I EA program
 - How well are assigned EA responsibilities being implemented?
 - What areas require greater attention?
- Project Approach
 - Surveys
 - Interviews
 - Data analysis
- Interview/survey participants
 - Global Combatant Commands (COCOMS)
 - Functional Combatant Command (USTRANSCOM)
 - Services (Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy)

Surveys and Interviews

Organization	Number of Surveys Returned	Interview Conducted	Category
AFRICOM	1	Yes	Global COCOM
CENTCOM	1	Yes	Global COCOM
EUCOM	6	Yes	Global COCOM
PACOM	6	Yes	Global COCOM
NORTHCOM	1	No*	Global COCOM
SOUTHCOM	3	Yes	Global COCOM
USTRANSCOM	1	Yes	Functional COCOM
Air Force	1	Yes	Service
Army	5	Yes	Service
Marine Corp	1	Yes	Service
Navy	1	Yes	Service

* NORTHCOM declined the interview request.

Agenda

- Overview
- **Findings**
- Recommendations



Overall Assessment

- DLA customers generally think that DLA is performing well as the EA
- USTRANSCOM is dissatisfied with distribution collaboration
- Survey Results
 - DLA is serving effectively as EA*:
 - COCOMS - 4.5
 - Services - 3.9
 - USTRANSCOM - 2.0
 - You are satisfied with Class I support provided by DLA*:
 - COCOMS - 4.5
 - Services - 4.2
 - USTRANSCOM - 2.0

Scale:
1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Sometimes Agree or Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

* Averages based on survey responses. Respondents were asked to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the above statements.

Overall Assessment (continued)

- Global COCOMs' higher effectiveness/satisfaction marks largely reflect responsiveness of DLA-collocated LNOs/Offices
 - If COCOMs need support from DLA, they know to whom to turn to obtain
 - Many COCOMs not familiar with operational subsistence issues
- Services/USTRANSCOM
 - Evaluations based primarily on working directly with DLA HQ/Troop Support through Joint Subsistence Policy Board (JSPB)/Working Groups on Class I issues
 - More knowledgeable about specific Class I areas of concern

The following slides represent customer opinions expressed in the surveys and/or interviews.

Scope

- Catalog management could be improved
 - New item introductions taking too long
 - Service HQs lack ability to restrict items
 - Inappropriate substitutions are being made
- OPRATS - low cost/technically acceptable criteria are not appropriate for subsistence
- OPRATS/PV - not adequately addressing cost vs. quality trade-offs
- Most satisfied with range of items offered; however, some noted that food-related items were not covered by the EA

Planning

- In general, DLA only receives the output of Service planning process (e.g., annual forecasts)...DLA reacts to orders
- Mixed awareness of SPIDERS scope, capabilities, and accessibility
- DLA not fully participating in COCOM annual planning meetings/conferences

Sourcing

- Need assistance with approval of local sources
- Non-logical price swings
- Fair and reasonable and sole source determinations need improvement
- Contracting officers (or alternates) not attending PV technical review panels
- Poor-performing PVs are repeatedly renewed on bridge contracts
- Assembly of OPRATs at Tracy could be improved

Distribution

- USTRANSCOM's low overall ratings based on excessive distribution costs due to under-utilization of containers
- Small containers with single OPRAT pushed forward in theater
- Stock rotation on pre-position ships is insufficient
- Delayed transportation deliveries due to unique customs and border restrictions in specific countries

Information

- Lack of visibility of PV supply chains
- CFMS implementation has been shut down, but requirement for joint system remains
- Metrics are insufficient
 - Prime Vendors
 - Performance-base agreements (PBAs)
- Lack of self-service access to Service data related to their items

Other

- Slow or lack of Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) resolution, too much focus on suppliers vice customers, variability of support in different theaters
- Need additional DLA outreach
 - DLA not represented at the Division/Brigade level; Current DLA relationships are HQ to HQ
 - Regional awareness is lacking below the COCOM level (e.g., status of forces agreements (SOFAs), mandatory sources, etc.)
 - Customers often unaware of what DLA contracts exist
- JSPB meetings cumbersome due to attendance of non-voting members

Agenda

- Overview
- Findings
- **Recommendations**



Recommendations

- **Scope**
 - Streamline process for adding new items to the catalog
 - Address customer concerns regarding
 - Food quality and nutrition
 - Substitutions
- **Planning**
 - Collaborate with Services in requirements planning process
 - Communicate availability and functionality of planning tools
- **Sourcing**
 - Include customers in evaluating PV performance and making selection decisions
 - Streamline “fair and reasonable” and “sole source determination” processes

Recommendations (continued)

- Distribution
 - Add incentives/penalties to PV contracts for container utilization
 - Enhance collaboration with USTRANSCOM on distribution issues
- Information
 - Re-evaluate PV metrics
 - Address weighting of metrics and calculation issues
 - Focus metrics on the customer
 - Collaborate with Services on replacement for CFMS
- Other
 - Improve outreach, communication, and customer focus
 - Consider providing additional DLA resources to assist customers below the COCOM level